

REMARKS

Claims 1-67 were pending at the time of examination. No claims have been cancelled. Claims 1-8, 13, 17-19, 21, 23, 26-30, 35, 39, 42-49, 54, 58-60, 62-65 and 67 have been amended. The applicants respectfully request reconsideration based on the foregoing amendments and these remarks.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph

Claims 63 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which the applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the Examiner stated that the terms “the at least one computer readable product” lacks antecedent basis in these claims. The applicants have amended claims 63 and 65 to recite “the computer readable product” and submit that both claim 63 and claim 65 are definite and that the rejection be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-23, 25-46, 47, 48-64 and 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,526,044 to Cookmeyer, II et al. (hereinafter Cookmeyer). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Generally, claim 1 has been amended to more clearly specify that the method is directed to correlating services within a computer network that exchanges application-level messages in order to more precisely define the subject matter of the invention. In the method of claim 1, a message interchange network for exchanging application-level messages between services is provided. Correlation information is tracked for these application-level messages so that it is clear for each application-level message that traverses the message interchange network, whether the message is related to any other messages in the message interchange network, and if so, what those messages are. The tracking can relate to, for example, request messages and associated responses, or status messages indicating whether a particular call of a service succeeded or failed, and so on, as described with respect to FIGs. 4A and 4B. As a result, the tracking of correlation information allows any end point or service on the message interchange network to easily gain a clear picture as to what is happening with messages sent as a result of its interactions with diverse services. Furthermore, since the retained correlation information is

performed by a single intermediary network, the correlation information is standardized and easily compiled in to a clear summary of interaction results (see specification, paragraph [0147]).

Cookmeyer, on the other hand, is directed to a knowledge base system which uses a "protocol analyzer" to acquire real time statistical data on network signal traffic in a monitoring session. The session performance history is then reported as a real time composite of measured statistics and analysis-derived statistics, together with a real time report of discarded frames (Cookmeyer, Abstract). All the statistical data that is gathered in Cookmeyer is related to low-level frame processing, which is clearly different from the application-level messages that are specified in claim 1. Furthermore, as is well-known in the art, when tracking frame-level data, the only data that is tracked is data that is related to the frame's destination and to how the frame will be combined with other frames when it is received at its final destination. Thus, in a low-level system such as the one described in Cookmeyer, it is not possible to track correlation information pertaining to "each application-level message and any other application-level messages related to the each application-level message." For at least these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is neither anticipated nor rendered obvious by Cookmeyer, and that the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) be withdrawn.

Claims 2-26 all depend from claim 1, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejections of claims 2-26 should be withdrawn.

Claim 27 is a computer system claim with limitations similar to the limitations of claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claims 27 should be withdrawn.

Claims 28-41 all depend from claim 27, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 27, and the rejections of claims 28-41 should be withdrawn.

Claim 42 is a *Beauregard* claim corresponding to claim 1, and is therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 1, and the rejection of claim 42 should be withdrawn.

Claims 43-67 all depend from claim 42, and are therefore neither anticipated nor obvious for at least the reasons discussed above with respect to claim 42, and the rejections of claims 43-67 should be withdrawn.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 24 and 65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cookmeyer in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,779,031 to Picher-Dempsey (hereinafter Picher-Dempsey). The applicants respectfully traverse the rejection for the following reasons.

Picher-Dempsey shows a network monitoring system in which only authorized users are allowed to make IP/QoS (Quality of Service) reservation requests. The Examiner argues that combining these techniques with Cookmeyer would render obvious “determining whether the first service is authorized to make the query and only sending correlation information to the first service when it is determined that the first service is authorized logging of billing information.” The applicants respectfully disagree that it would be obvious to combine these two documents, since Cookmeyer is directed to a packet-level monitoring system and Picher-Dempsey appears to operate on higher-level messages. Furthermore, even if one assumes that it were possible to combine Cookmeyer and Picher-Dempsey, it would still not render claims 24 and 65 any more obvious than claims their respective independent claims 1 and 42, respectively, as Picher-Dempsey does not cure the other deficiencies of Cookmeyer discussed above. It is therefore respectfully submitted that the rejection of claims 24 and 65 be withdrawn.

Conclusion

The applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS, LLP



Fredrik Mollborn
Reg. No. 48,587

P.O. Box 70250
Oakland, CA 94612-0250
(650) 961-8300